



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,574	10/24/2001	Hannu Kuoksa	33047/240187	5083

826 7590 01/03/2006

ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

HENDRICKSON, STUART L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1754

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/003,574

Applicant(s)

KUOKSA, HANNU

Examiner

Stuart Hendrickson

Art Unit

1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-12,14,15 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) above is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1754

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, 15 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baines taken with Mosow 5213663 and the admissions on pg. 5 of the specification.

Baines teaches in columns 5 and 9 computer control of a causticization process. The computer can monitor any parameter characteristic of the system and send via feedback loop controls to other inputs to achieve a stable reaction system. The differences versus the claims is what variables are monitored. Musow teaches in columns 2 and 4 that each system can have a different variable measured, like titratable alkali or density. Applicant admits that FI '662 teaches the measurement of green density and control of white infeed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to control the infeeds as in '662 and monitor the density or alkali in the process of Baines because doing so asserts control over the process for monitoring for optimum results. Note that in general, processes can be optimized (In re Boesch 205 USPQ 215). The workings of how the computer makes calculations (claims 8, 12, 14) are deemed conventional as to how computer control programs work- see Baines column 9. Choosing coefficients which accurately model reality is an obvious expedient, to assure efficiency.

Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The US equivalent of '662 teaches in col. 3 lines 30-40 monitoring green liquor. In the claims, control of density of the green liquor is accomplished by controlling the addition of white liquor. Musow col. 1 lines 25-30 teach adding white liquor, so no patentable difference is seen. It is noted that the specification does not teach the composition of the white liquor, or details thereof. It appears that fig. 3 of the patent cited as the translation of '662 teaches the claimed control of density of the green liquor, or in any event suggests it, since density is being monitored. (The patent applicant cites in column 8 makes reference to a procedure. **Further details of this methodology are requested for proper evaluation of the issues.**)

Art Unit: 1754

Essentially, the claims are an indirect way of performing the control exerted more directly by the references. However, this is an obvious expedient, given a known and well-characterized reaction system and relationships between the species, as explained supra and in the references. The references applied do teach controlling the density of green liquor- they simply do not discuss doing so. On pg.3 of the response is an underlined sentence which is said to be the crux of the invention. However this feature is found neither in the claims nor specification, and thus is not persuasive. As far as relying upon one measurement cautioned against by Baines, this is an obvious expedient given that one is warned of the risks and given the simplified apparatus requirement of having only one thing to measure.

Previous arguments and comments are incorporated herein by reference. *The SPS did not have a fee or certified statement and thus has not been considered.*

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (571) 272-1351.



Stuart Hendrickson
examiner Art Unit 1754